Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—Will the investigation be expedited ?

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—It is being done.

Mr. T. THIMMARAYAPPA.—What are the three places at which *anicuts* are proposed to be constructed and the estimated cost of each of the projects ?

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—The places are Manchanabele, Hunasanahalli, and Nidigal. The first two projects are estimated to cost Rs. 4·3 lakhs and Rs. 9·25 lakhs, respectively, and the estimate for the third one is Rs. 6·1 lakhs.

Mr. T. THIMMARAYAPPA.—How much land is expected to be irrigated with the help of each ?

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—

Under	Manchanabele	1,170	acres
,,	Hunasanahalli	4,000	,,
,,	Nidigal	2,370	,,

Mr. Gurukar VENKATARAMANE GOWDA.—What is the rate of contribution expected of the raiyats ?

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—Rs. 150 per acre.

Mr. Gurukar VENKATARAMANE GOWDA.—What will be the rate of assessment ?

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—Rs. 6.

Mr. Gurukar VENKATARAMANE GOWDA.—Will not the contribution of Rs. 150 per acre be too high ?

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—No; voluntary contributions range from Rs. 175 to Rs. 200 in other projects.

Restoration of Tanks.

Q.—3. Messrs. Y. V. MUNISAMI IYER (Channapatna Municipality); B. L. BYANNA and C. N. NARASINGA RAO (Bangalore City Municipality); B. MUNIVENKATAPPA and N. APPANNA REDDY (Bangalore Taluk); B. M. MUNISWAMAPPA, K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR and A. N. RAMA RAO (Special Interests); T. MADIAH GOWDA (Channapatna Taluk); B. CHOODE GOWDA (Closepet Taluk); S. KARIYAPPA, V. L. CHAME GOWDA and Gurukar VENKATARAMANE GOWDA (Kankanhalli Taluk); Patel HANUME GOWDA (Dodballapur Taluk); GURUSWAMI GOWDA (Hosakote Taluk); A. HANUMANTHARAYAPPA (Devanhalli Taluk); S. SARABHANNA (Anekal Taluk); B. MALLAPPA and A. M. CHANNAMARE GOWDA (Nelamangala Taluk); Patel HONNASIDDIAH (Magadi Taluk); A. M. VENKATASWAMAIYA (Closepet Municipality); K. P. PARASIVIAH (Kankanhalli Municipality) and K. NARAYANA SETTY (Magadi Municipality).

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) how many major and minor tanks are there in the State;

(*b*) of these, how many major and minor tanks have been restored;

(*c*) what is the extent of wet lands under cultivation in excess of the irrigable capacity of these tanks ?

A.—The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (Mr. R. W. Scaldwell).—

(*a*) There are 2,656 major and 20,803 minor tanks in the State.

(*b*) 2,387 major and 4,932 minor tanks have been restored to the end of 1935-36.

(*c*) Information is impossible to be furnished without an elaborate survey of the present capacities of all tanks.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISAMI IYER.—There is a very large number of unrestored tanks, and the raiyats are thereby put to great loss every year. Should not the Government do everything necessary for restoring them early ?

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—That is being done every year to the extent that grants are available.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISAMI IYER.—With reference to answer (*c*) is it under contemplation to make a survey of the capacities of all the tanks ?

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—No. Individual cases of tanks brought to notice are taken up for investigation.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA.—Are not complaints made at almost every session of this Assembly that several tanks are remaining unrestored for long ?

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—All tanks cannot be taken up for restoration at once. They are being taken up according to urgency and to the extent that funds permit.

Mr. RAME GOWDA.—In answer to (*c*) it is stated that information relating to all tanks cannot be given. Is it not a fact that at the time of preparation of every project a survey will have been made and the *atchkat* fixed ?

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—Yes.

Mr. RAME GOWDA.—Will not the revenue records show whether the present *atchkat* in any given case shows an increase over the extent originally fixed, and if so, will not the increase constitute in itself a reason for the inadequacy of the water supplied ?

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari).—The question as it has been put suggests an elaborate survey of all the tanks which it is not possible to hold.

Mr. B. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—In view of the difficulties that are increasingly coming to the notice of the Government, will they be pleased to increase the grant for restoration of minor tanks ?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—That is a suggestion which Government may well consider.

Mr. Ballam SRINIVASA RAO.—In the case of a tank which gets silted up or becomes leaky within one or two years after restoration, should they not clear the silt and prevent the water from flowing out ?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—The Chief Engineer will inquire into such cases.

Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA.—Unless fresh silting up of restored tanks is prevented in some effective manner, will not all the expenditure incurred on their restoration be a mere waste ?

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Will it not be just and equitable to all concerned if restoration of minor tanks is undertaken according to a definite programme and on a districtwar basis, so that a definite number of tanks may be restored in each district every year ? Will it be right to spend away all the grant for any year on restoring tanks in only one or two taluks ?

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau).—Petitions are received from all parts and all the cases are examined and works taken up according to urgency.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Petitions have been submitted by the Nagamangala raiyats on a number of occasions, but the urgency of the cases concerned has not been realised. In the case of minor tanks at least, will the Government be pleased to reduce the rate of contribution ? The main reason for non-restoration seems to be that the payment of the contribution to the last pie is insisted upon and the raiyats are often unable to pay it in full. Government should not always be particular about enforcing the letter of the law.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—According to the scheme laid down for minor tank restoration, a contribution of one-fourth the estimated cost or all the excess over 24 years' assessment, whichever is less, has to be paid by the raiyats. How can the department execute the works if the contribution is not paid according to the raiyats' own *mutchalikas* ?

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—If the Government are so eager to enforce the letter of the law, why have they collected more than one-fourth from the parties ? Will the Government agree to pay back the difference in cases in which they have collected over and above the stipulated rates ?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—That question does not arise now.

Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA.—It is for regular restoration that the raiyats have to give the contribution. If it is merely a case of raising the waste-weir, why should contribution be collected ?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—In the case of restoration of minor tanks, the contribution is given in place of earth-work and turfing, etc., which the raiyats themselves have to do under the rules. Work is taken up according to urgency and in cases where the parties concerned are willing to pay contribution.

The Assembly rose for lunch at 3 p.m. and met again at 3-30 p.m.

Prohibition of Election Speeches.

Q.—4. Messrs. C. N. NARASINGA RAO and B. L. BYANNA (Bangalore City Municipality) ; B. MUNIVENKATAPPA and N. APPANNA REDDY (Bangalore Taluk) ; B. M. MUNISWAMAPPA, K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR and A. N. RAMA RAO (Special Interests) ; T. MADIAH